

REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action dated August 22, 2007. The examiner objected to the title of the invention. Claims 1-26 have been rejected by the Examiner. Claims 1-26 remain pending. Claim 24 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claim 24 to correct the informalities and claim 22 to amend an informality (missing period). Claims 1, 11, and 21 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. In view of the amendments and following remarks, Applicants believe that this amendment is fully responsive to the Office Action and functions to render all claims patentable over the art of record.

SPECIFICATION

The Examiner alleges the title of the invention is “not descriptive”. Specifically, the examiner states “a new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.” The examiner has not cited any authority to establish this position, as such, Applicant has no clear reference as to the alleged deficiency nor guidance as to what would satisfy the Examiner. The preamble of originally filed claim 1 is “computer-implemented method for facilitating group management functionality” and of originally filed claim 11 is “group management system”. The current title of the application is “GROUP MANAGEMENT SYSTEM AND METHOD”, which incorporates the substantial meaning of the claim preamble.

However, applicant has amended the preamble of the pending claims and offers the title “METHOD AND SYSTEM FOR FACILITATING GROUP MANAGEMENT FUNCTIONALITY OF A GROUP PUBLICATION”.

As such, a Substitute Title has been amended to correct the cited informalities.

OBJECTED CLAIMS

Claims 24 has been objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended claim 24 to correct the informality. Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC § 102(b)

The Examiner rejected claims 1-26 as being anticipated by LEAGUELINEUP.com. Independent claims 1, 14, 27 33 and 37 have been amended to more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention. Specifically, independent claims 1, 14, 27 33 and 37 have been amended to include the limitation that the activity and participants are preexisting. In view of the claim amendments and following remarks, the Examiner's rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges, as per claim 1, LEAGUELINEUP.com teaches a method for maintaining a group instantiation including information representing a group of members and a group activity participated in by said members; creating a website structure instantiation including content fields corresponding to at least a portion of said information; and creating a group activity publication layout including content fields corresponding to at least a portion of said information (where information representing the group activity, creating a web site structure instantiation, and creating a group activity publication on page 9). The Examiner has merely provided archive screen captures of the LEAGUELINEUP.com website from Archive.org, which identify features, but do not describe how the process or how it works. Additionally, the Examiner claims that the system as set forth in claim 11 is disclosed on page 9. There is no mention of an apparatus, for example a server, as set forth on line 1, page 22 of the instant application.

In order to apply Section 102(b), the invention must be “patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of the application for patent in the United States”. The Examiner draws a conclusion that if the archived pages describe features of Applicants invention, the referenced pages followed the method and

utilized the system that Applicant claimed prior to the critical date. It may very well be the case that the instantiation Examiner alleges to exist was not employed, if at all, until after the filing date of Applicant's instant application. In order to provide a proper 102(b) reference, the Examiner must provide a reference that describes the process and/or system and not merely a list of features coupled to Examiner's conclusion that it must follow the method or include the system claimed by Applicant. No such reference has been set forth, and accordingly, this 102(b) rejection must be removed. Withdrawal of this section 102(b) rejection for failing to make a *prima facie* case is earnestly solicited.

The present invention discloses a method and system for group management functionality of a group publication. The present invention is directed toward an online the activity may be, for example, baseball and the participants may be members of a baseball team participating in the baseball game. On page 9 the cited reference from Archive.org, LEAGUELINEUP.com provides a means for building a team website rather than a team book. The cited reference does not mention the function of enabling designation of participant profile content within a group activity publication template. This feature personalizes the present invention by, for example, permitting the players to answer questions, such as their favorite sport. Additionally, non-sports questions, such as who the athlete looks up to; such information would be useful to a recruiter in determining whether to draft a young athlete.

To more particularly point out and distinctly claim the present invention, the restriction of enabling a designation of participant profile content within a group activity publication template has been added to claims 1, 11, and 21.

It is clear that LEAGUELINEUP.com reference fails to disclose all of the elements claimed by Applicant in claims 1, 11, and 21, as amended. For the above reasons, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw this Section 102(a) rejection and allow Claims 1, 11, and 21 and their respective dependent claims, as they depend from allowable claims. Accordingly, Claims 1-26 define patentably distinct inventions that are allowable over the art of record.

CONCLUSION

The entire office action of August 22, 2007 has been reviewed carefully and this amendment is believed to be fully responsive thereto.

In view of the above, it is the Applicant's belief that all pending claims are now in condition for allowance. As a result, the Examiner is respectfully requested to examine claims 1-26 and issue a Notice of allowance in due course indicating all claims are patentable under the provisions of Title 35 of the United States Code. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present application, he is cordially invited to contact the undersigned at (248) 865-9430.

Respectfully submitted,
The WEINTRAUB GROUP, P.L.C.
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: February 22, 2008

By: Arnold S. Weintraub

Arnold S. Weintraub, Reg. No. 25523
The Weintraub Group, P.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant
32000 Northwestern Highway, Suite 240
Farmington Hills, Michigan 48334
(248) 865-9430
(248) 865-9436 (facsimile)